

Remarks

Claims 1-4 are presently pending. Claim 4 has been cancelled without prejudice. **Claims 1-4 have been rejected.**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,539,378 to Chang. The Examiner states that in reference to claims 1 and 2, Chang discloses the claimed electronic security system comprising a) the claimed transmitter positionable within a deadbolt housing within a door jamb of an existing door assembly, the transmitter being engaged when a deadbolt is positioned within the deadbolt housing in a locked orientation, the transmitter emitting a signal once the deadbolt is removed, the transmitter including an activation switch in communication, the activation switch positioned adjacent to the existing door assembly, which is met by the safety lock system including a signal transmitting means 3 including the main lock body 1, both latch pins 11, actuating member 12, deadbolt 13, fixing member 14 and key receiving

mechanism 15. Microswitches 122, 142, 132 are situated such that when the deadbolt 13 is removed from a stopping member 21, the contact of a microswitch 132 fails to contact a rod 131 and an alarm signal will be transmitted to a remote receiving means 4, and b) the claimed receiver in communication with the transmitter, the receiver having an internal alarm annunciator with corresponding on/off switch, the receiver receiving the signal from the transmitter, which is met by a receiving means 4 receiving the signal from the transmitting means 3 and immediately actuating the alarm speaker 42; the receiving means 4 including several switches 43 to control the turning on/off of the receiving means 4 or to instantly actuate a test.

Regarding claim 3, the Examiner states that Chang discloses a transmitter including an activation switch in communication therewith, the activation switch being positionable adjacent to the existing door assembly, which is met by transmitting means 3 including a manual switch 33 for testing the system as well as for cutting the system on/off.

Regarding claim 4, the Examiner states Chang discloses that the claimed internal alarm annunciator of the receiver

has a corresponding on/off switch, which is met by the receiving means 4 including several switches 43 to control the turning on/off of the receiving means 4 or to instantly actuate a test.

These rejections are respectfully but strenuously traversed for the reasons set forth in detail below.

Prior art is anticipatory only if it explicitly or inherently discloses every limitation recited in the claims (M.P.E.P. 2131.05 [R-2]). In order for prior art to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), a single prior art reference must teach all aspects of the claim rejected.

The rejection of claims 1-4 as being anticipated by Chang fails to satisfy this criterion. Regarding claims 1 and 2, the transmitter and receiver of the claimed invention operates in a manner wholly different than Chang. Specifically, the alarm in Chang is actuated when the deadbolt is fully extended by a rearward spring during tampering, causing the traverse rod to contact a third microswitch (col. 3, lines 17-24), connecting the X and Y wires. By contrast, the system of the claimed invention is

actuated by the removal of the deadbolt from the deadbolt housing, not the deadbolt's extension via a rearward spring. Therefore, Chang does not disclose a security system that sounds an alarm upon removal of the deadbolt. Consequently, claims 1 and 2 are patentably distinct from the cited reference.

Regarding claim 3, the manual switch 33 of Chang is located upon the transmitting means 3 (col. 2, lines 25-60) (Fig. 3). Chang does not disclose alternate embodiments of the manual switch. Conversely, claim 3 of the present invention provides for an activation switch positionable adjacent to the existing door assembly, allowing, in the preferred embodiment, said activation switch to resemble a standard wall switch (Fig. 1). Besides being more aesthetically pleasing than the device of Chang, the present invention of claim 3 is substantially easier to operate, because the switch is made readily accessible, than Chang, thereby making it more likely that a user will turn the present invention on. Consequently, claims 1 and 2 are patentably distinct from the cited reference.

Regarding claim 4, claim 4 has been cancelled, thus the Examiner's rejection has been obviated.

The reference does not explicitly or inherently disclose every limitation recited in the claims, namely a transmitter actuated by the removal of a deadbolt from the deadbolt housing and turned on by an easy to operate switch, and therefore rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is improper.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully solicited. Please remove the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and enter the allowance of claims 1-3. The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard W. Goldstein
Registration No. 36,527
Goldstein Law Offices, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant
2071 Clove Road
Staten Island, NY 10304
(718) 727-9780